

MARCH 21, 1946

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

H. V. KALTENBORN

HENRY CABOT LODGE

JOSEPH C. HARSCH

JEROME DAVIS

(See also page 12)

COMING

—March 28, 1946—

**Who Should Control the Production and Use
of Atomic Energy?**

—April 4, 1946—

**Should the Draft Be Extended Beyond
May 15?**

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

ONE DOLLAR PER COPY, 10¢ A COPY

VOLUME 11, NUMBER 47



\$4.50 A YEAR : 10¢ A COPY

★ ★ ★ CONTENTS ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 21:

"Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?"

<i>Mr. DENNY</i>	3
<i>Mr. KALTENBORN</i>	4
<i>Mr. DAVIS</i>	7
<i>Mr. HARSCH</i>	9
<i>Senator LODGE</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	16

THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 28:

"Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?"

THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 4:

"Should the Draft Be Extended Beyond May 15?"

The Broadcast of March 21, 1946, originated in Town Hall, in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.S.T., over the American Broadcasting Company Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MARCH 21, 1946

VOL. 11, No. 47

Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?

Announcer:

Back in Town Hall, New York, just a whisper off Times Square on West 43rd Street, we bring you another lively session of America's Town Meeting of the Air. As you may have seen in the papers, last week your Town Meeting won top honors in its field from the Nation's radio editors in the poll conducted by the magazine, *Billboard*.

This week the George Foster Peabody Award for the best radio program was made, and, for the second time, your Town Meeting topped the list in its field. The citation reads as follows: "The edification, the fearlessness, and the fair, firm moderation which has characterized George V. Denny, Jr.'s selection and conduct of the America's Town Meeting of the Air was never more urgently needed by conscientious listeners. To Mr. Denny, to his able staff,

and to the American Broadcasting Company, we take pleasure in presenting the Peabody Award for the outstanding educational program of 1945."

Mr. Denny has the distinction of being the first double winner. Town Meeting received the medal in 1943 and is still the irresistible leader in its field. This program has served as a stalwart example for 26 Junior Town Meetings which are perpetuating the principles of free debate among the citizens of tomorrow. Congratulations to you, Mr. Denny. (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors and thank you, Fred Cole, for the way you read that citation—particularly that part about "is still the irresistible leader in its field." I liked that.

There are a great many people responsible for the success of

America's Town Meeting of the Air, and they are all entitled to a share of credit for all the honors that come to us. I wish it were possible for us to name all of them here tonight, but it isn't.

Tonight's program, "Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia," was planned as a salute to the United Nations Organization, which was to have opened its Security Council sessions here today. Although this opening has been postponed until Monday, we do extend our heartiest greetings to all the delegates, and we hope that America's Town Meeting will serve a useful purpose in discussing informally and unofficially, for the benefit of the American people, the issues that they—the delegates—must consider and take action upon officially in the weeks ahead.

If we ever hope to establish law and justice in the world for all men and all nations, we must learn to reason together, as we shall attempt to reason together tonight, and we cannot reason together fruitfully unless we face up to all of the essential facts. But, as we all know, the same set of facts may appear quite different when looked upon from different points of view. That is why we always try to give you both sides on America's Town Meeting of the Air.

Mr. Kaltenborn, as Dean of American radio commentators, as a trained observer in the field of

international relations, as a Town Hall lecturer and author, you will be the first to grant the other fellow the right to his opinion, even if you do argue with him vigorously to come around to your point of view. What's your opinion on tonight's question, "Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?" I give you H. V. Kaltenborn. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

This is the third time in something like a year that George Denny has invited me to join a Town Hall discussion on Russia. Why? Because Russia's aggression against neighbor countries has created headlines. The Town Hall of the Air is one of radio's consistent prize winners because it presents balanced discussion of headline topics.

Do we and the British have occasion to fear Russia? Of course, we have. We face a threat to world peace; fortunately, we face it together. If we had to face it separately, it would be much more dangerous.

So long as Britain and the United States continue to do two things there will be no war with Russia.

What are these things?

First, we must maintain our armaments. Both Great Britain and the United States must make it clear to the world that they intend to maintain selective service for the present. They must show

the world what they intend to maintain in the way of an adequate navy and an adequate air force.

On the testimony of our military leaders, we have permitted our army, our air force, and our navy to disintegrate. In our legitimate desire to bring home at once those who bore the burden of the battle, we have neglected the needs of our occupation forces.

Our failure at this moment of international tension to maintain our military strength would be notice to Russia that we are both unprepared and unwilling to back words with deeds. Give that notice to a ruthless, totalitarian power, which is seeking domination in both Europe and Asia, and the result will be a series of continuing aggressions that might well lead to war.

Remember Munich!

The second thing we must do to avoid war is to support, without fear or favor, the principles of the United Nations Charter. The Preamble to the World Charter states that the peoples of the United Nations are determined to enforce respect for obligations arising from treaties. It states that they are determined that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.

In the independent state of Iran, Russia has violated a solemn treaty which she signed with Iran and Great Britain. She has violated a

solemn agreement signed by Joseph Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin D. Roosevelt for the withdrawal of troops from Iran. She has used armed force to coerce a weak neighbor power. Tonight she is bearing down on little Iran with all her diplomatic and military strength to force a change of government before Monday.

Russia has disdained to reply to repeated requests from Britain and the United States for an explanation of these violations of solemn promises. The State of Iran has now filed an appeal to the Security Council of the United Nations. The main duties of this Council, as outlined by the Charter, are to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes and to prevent or stop aggression.

On Monday, here in New York City, the United States will stand side by side with the peace-minded non-Communist nations of the world to defend those principles of justice and fair dealing on which alone the peace of the world can rest. (*Applause.*)

Both President Truman and Secretary of State Byrnes have taken their stand in defense of the United Nations Charter. They emphasize the determination of this country to support and defend the principles of peace, because they are being challenged by an aggression-minded power. Today the President of the United States

wisely rejected Russia's suggestion to postpone next week's Council meeting.

Again, wisely, he also rejected Senator Pepper's foolish proposal for another Big Three appeasement meeting.

Three times a President of the United States has journeyed thousands of miles to see Joseph Stalin. Now let Joseph Stalin come to see him. (*Applause.*)

Does the Soviet Union want war? Certainly not.

Will she provoke war? Not if we stand fast against aggression. Don't forget that until now Great Britain and the United States have permitted Russia to get what she wants. We permitted her to impose a ruthless peace on Finland. We allowed her to absorb the independent countries of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia. We pretended to defend a democratic Poland.

Actually, we permitted Russia to establish a ruthless, Communist dictatorship in what remained of that Catholic country after Russia annexed what she wanted.

We have permitted Russia to dominate Catholic Hungary—this, after a free election in which the Communists were defeated.

We have permitted a Czech Communist minority to curtail those political liberties which were the pride of Czechoslovakia between two wars.

We have recognized totalitarian

Communist dictatorships in Albania, in Yugoslavia, in Rumania.

We have permitted Russia to take over the vast province of outer Mongolia.

By the unhappy Yalta agreement which I criticized from this platform one year ago, we have permitted Russia to dominate Manchuria, northern Korea, to annex the southern half of Sakhalin Island and to annex all the Kuril Islands.

That is our shameful record of appeasement. What has it brought? Further aggression in Iran, further threats of aggression against Turkey, against Iraq, and against the Dardanelles.

It has brought demands for new Russian bases in North Africa, in East Africa, and in the Mediterranean Islands.

It has brought a Russian spy campaign and a Communist propaganda campaign unequaled by anything in the prewar period. The world will be astounded and alarmed when it learns what really happened in Canada.

When I returned from Europe a year ago, I was impelled to report on the way in which the Communist menace had spread its tentacles all over war-weary Europe. I have just returned from South America where I learned about the dangerous Communist penetration in that Continent.

How dare anyone suggest that we should give more, yield more,

appease more. Do we need to fear Russia? Of course, we need to fear her. We must resist Russia's Communist and imperialist penetration. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Our next speaker is a foreign correspondent, author, lecturer, former member of the faculty of Yale University, who has quite a different view of these facts which Mr. Kaltenborn has spoken of, and he may have some facts of his own to add. Mr. Jerome Davis. Mr. Davis. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Davis:

Mr. Kaltenborn forgets that America and Britain have no more reason to fear Russia than Russia has to fear us. We cannot afford to be self-righteous. (*Applause.*) Russia has many faults. So do we. We must work together in spite of them.

Russia is seeking what she considers her future security. So are we. Neither side is wholly right or wholly wrong.

Let's end the wave of false propaganda and war hysteria against Russia. (*Applause.*) Have we forgotten that she lost in the cause of freedom for her country and for ours at least fifty per cent more men than all the rest of the European allies put together.

Does America realize that Russia destroyed at least twenty times as many Germans as the rest of the Allies combined. (*Applause.*)

Kaltenborn says that Russia imposed a ruthless peace on Finland. On the contrary, the Allied Ambassadors, including our own, recognized the peace as scrupulously fair. Russia has since given Finland free elections and fair play.

I am not in the confidence of Stalin. But Russia's aims are apparent. They desperately want peace and a chance to rebuild their thousands of shattered factories and cities over an area as large as from New York to Oklahoma. Russia has no colonies, wants none. Because Russia wants peace, she desires friendly governments on her border.

Britain has oil in southern Iran. Russia feels entitled to the oil in the north. She does not want to conquer other lands, but naturally wants to recover territory torn from her after the last war.

She wants free access to the Dardanelles and protection through fortifications. This is just as necessary a life line to Russia as Gibraltar is to Britain and Panama to the United States. (*Applause.*)

Nothing in these desires is sinister. If we were in Russia's place, we would want them. Supposing you were a Russian. How would you feel about our actions? After the first World War, the Allies invaded Russia from the north, south, east, and west. The British marched into the oil center of Baku through Iran.

They captured twenty-six of the

leading Bolsheviks and shot them. The invasion cost Britain alone five hundred million dollars and the Japanese a billion yen.

Major General Graves, commander of the United States forces, tells the awful story of murder in Siberia and concludes, "The United States gained by this action the resentment of more than ninety per cent of the Russian people."

Russia estimates the damage to the Soviet Union by intervention totals sixty billion dollars, besides seven million dead.

For sixteen years we refused to recognize Russia. Then the whole world ignored Foreign Commissar Litvinoff when he said, "peace was indivisible" and pleaded for joint action against Japanese, Fascist, and Nazi aggression.

Even in 1940 Britain proposed to send troops to fight Russia through Finland and was blocked only by the refusal of Sweden.

Today the President demands peacetime military conscription—an unprecedented step. He says, "Keep the secret of the atomic bomb." Not content with the huge pile of bombs, we continue manufacturing thousands more to the tune of five hundred million dollars a year! The Russians wonder against whom.

With no military alliance, Britain and America still hold joint staff conferences. United States troops still remain in China.

In Iran, our officers are training an army of 100,000.

We have over fifty bases scattered over the world. Apparently, our intention is to hold several in the Pacific in disregard of the Atlantic Charter.

The American people are unalterably opposed to war with Russia. The Soviet people unitedly want peace and friendship with us.

Both aims can be achieved by these four steps:

1. Appreciation of Russia's aid to the common allied cause during the war and her fifteen million dead.

2. Recognition of the remarkable progress of Russia in the short period since the overthrow of the Czarist tyranny.

3. Recognition that Russia is doing what we would be doing in her place with her antecedents and we are acting as Russia would if she were in our place with our background.

Let us not single out Russia for criticism alone. Kaltenborn demands that we stop Russia. I wish Russian troops were out of Iran but let us stand for justice everywhere.

Harold Laski, chairman of the British Labor Party Executive now says Churchill has done all that lies within his power to restore King George to a Greece which he put in chains. Laski went on to criticize the British Empire in Rhodesia and Kenya. In Egypt

thousands of students have been rioting against the presence of British troops saying the treaty was forced on the nation.

Ever since the first World War, Britain has been promising independence to India with one-fifth of the population of the earth, yet when I saw Gandhi, he said that India is a giant prison house kept in bondage by Britain. I could find no one from prince to pauper who in private didn't want independence.

Finally, President Truman, Attlee, and Stalin should meet together. They should talk over differences face to face and make adjustments in a give and take process. It is popular in reactionary circles to talk about the appeasement of Russia but it is false to say that President Roosevelt was appeasing Russia unjustly at Yalta. The Soviet Union, in her turn, has compromised with us again and again.

Instead of hysteria and fear, the United States should set an example of trust, understanding, and friendship with Russia. Let us stand for justice as we see it and Russia for justice as she sees it, and work out a solution of justice for both of us. Let us back UNO but prove to Russia that the English-speaking world is not ganging up on her, that Russia can get fair consideration for her viewpoint. In regard to the Soviet Union, as President Roosevelt said, "We have

nothing to fear except fear itself." (Applause.)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Jerome Davis. Now we're going to hold up hearing from ex-Colonel Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., until we hear from another foreign correspondent and distinguished radio news analyst and writer for the *Christian Science Monitor*, Mr. Joseph C. Harsch. Mr. Harsch. (Applause.)

Mr. Harsch:

It seems to me that Mr. Kaltenborn has jumped over several doubts and even one or two facts straight to the assumption that Russia is committed irrevocably to all the aggression that the traffic will bear. It also seems to me that Mr. Davis is afraid of the things that Russia might do under the provocation of a hypocritical western world which preaches the dawn of brotherly love but practices, with nicer manners, of course, the very aggression which alarms us so when we see it in Russia but refuse to recognize in ourselves. (Applause.)

My own feeling is that this question requires refinement. There are some qualifications to Mr. Kaltenborn's case of a Russia fattening on appeasement and to say that the blame may lie as much with us as with Russia changes the context of the problem that leaves us with it still burning our hands.

We must find a remedy. I think we can find the remedy best if we

distinguish between basic, unavoidable grounds for fear and grounds which develop through blundering and stupidity on all sides.

When the question is put the way it is here tonight, the answer must, of course, be "yes." But what are the real reasons? What are the manufactured and imagined and still avoidable reasons for fear of Russia?

One first reason is that we and the Russians don't talk the same way, don't think the same way, don't behave the same way, don't react to the same stimuli. Therefore, neither is able to anticipate what the other will do or understand what he does when he does it.

The misunderstandings arising out of this have been magnified by the honeymoon we had with the Russians during the war. We led ourselves into the habit of thinking that they belong to the same age and the same civilization that we do. We ignored the differences and magnified the similarities.

That has forced a rude awakening on both of us. In the gray light of dawn, we find the girl we married eating crackers in bed. (*Laughter.*) We also discover that she believes in whipping children, a practice we consider out of date. She discovers that we didn't mean it for keeps when we put that string of grandmother's pearls around her neck. So the marriage is a failure. We are incompatible. So we are in the inflamed bickering

resentments of the divorce courts right now.

We accuse Russia of trying to make us a slave in her kitchen and she accuses us of the same design. There's reason enough for fear in all this and the reason is all the greater because it has caught us both by surprise.

We must fear misunderstandings between nations which live in different ages and derive from vastly different backgrounds. We must fear right now the result of the shock on both of us of rediscovering these differences and of uncovering the reservations which were unstated when we were whispering sweet words to each other.

The result is that statesmen on neither side were prepared to meet the true nature of our relationship. We're not lovers. We're strangers, competitors, business rivals, and power rivals.

We forget that this is not new. I think Mr. Kaltenborn overlooks the similarity between what Soviet Russia is doing now and what Czarist Russia did over several hundred years, and also that, in spite of constant Russian pressure in precisely the same places and directions, the Western World and Russia always came together in every major war.

I think Dr. Davis may have overlooked the strain and even the limited wars involved in this chronic rivalry between the times when West and Russia stood together on

big issues. There was no time in the past when rivalry between Russia and the West was solved on a long-term basis. But there was also no time when statesmen were unable to keep it within reasonable bounds when they tried hard enough and intelligently enough.

That leads to another reason for fear which is present with us right now. We are arming against each other in terms of war resources, strategic positions, and weapons. We're both doing it. But not since the day the big bomb hit Hiroshima have our respective statesmen come to real grips on a workable, power relationship between us.

The Russians have been rebuilding methodically the old Czarist Empire with its spheres of influence in the name of democracy and peace.

The British have been clinging to their old empire in the name of necessity. We Americans have built a vast new empire in the name of freedom. We all preach orderly revision and all cite the United Nations Charter against the revisions effected by the others. But none of us is yet willing to define the limits of his own ambitions, except possibly Britain which just wants to hold what it has.

How can anyone say in such a troubled time that any one of the three is committed to unlimited aggression? Any one of the three might be, if you judge from the

present records. Perhaps the Russians are. It is just as tenable a thesis as the reverse, or that we are ourselves.

What we must do is to find out and we won't find out until we all three are willing to sit down to the real peace table. Russia certainly isn't ready for it at the moment. I'm not sure that we are either. But at least more efforts could be made than are being made to get ready for it.

I suggest that what we have to fear most is the present weakness of statesmanship on all sides in a period of angry and surprised awakening to realities. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Harsch. It's going to be hard to tell which side Mr. Harsch and Senator Lodge are on, because at some points they cross swords with both speakers. Now we're going to hear from the celebrated war veteran, a former Republican Senator from the State of Massachusetts, and until recently a colonel in the United States Army. It gives me great pleasure to present Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. Senator Lodge. (*Applause.*)

Senator Lodge:

I like Dr. Davis' suggestion that we avoid hysteria. As a matter of fact, that is the reason why I do not enthuse about the question, "Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia," because for one thing, it assumes that Brit-

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

JEROME DAVIS—An educator, sociologist, author, and foreign correspondent, Mr. Davis has spent much time in Russia. He was born of American parents, in Kioto, Japan, in 1891. He has an A.B. from Oberlin College, is a graduate of Union Theological Seminary, has an M.A. and a Ph.D. from Columbia, a D.D. from Oberlin, and an LL.D. from Hillsdale.

In 1913, Dr. Davis taught in Minneapolis and was secretary of civic work for the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Assn. The next year, he was a lecturer in extension course in New York City. In 1915, he acted as secretary to Dr. Wilfred Grenfell at his Labrador Mission, and during the next two years engaged in Russian war work. He made a survey of the Russians in America for the International Church World Movement.

Dr. Davis has taught sociology at Dartmouth and practical philanthropy at the Yale Divinity School. He has served as president of the American Federation of Teachers and has directed work in Prisoner-of-War camps in Canada. Investigations in which he has taken part have ranged from the coal fields of West Virginia to conditions in Russia.

Mr. Davis has served on numerous commissions and committees dealing with social conditions throughout the world and has written many books, several of which deal with Russia.

HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.—When he was elected Republican Senator from Massachusetts in 1936. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., was following in the footsteps of his grandfather who was also a member of the Senate.

Senator Lodge was born in Nahant, Massachusetts, in 1902. He is a graduate of Middlesex School in Concord, and has an A.B. degree from Harvard. He was on the staff of the *Boston Evening Transcript* in 1924, and of the *New York Herald Tribune* from 1925 to 1931. In 1932, he was elected Representative to the General Court of Massachusetts, and re-elected in 1934. In 1936, he was elected to the United States Senate. He was re-elected in 1942, but entered active Army duty. An active Reserve Officer since 1925, Senator Lodge served as a major

with the 1st American Tank Detachment in Libya. He has recently been released from the Army with the rank of Lieutenant Colonel.

JOSEPH C. HARSCH—Joseph C. Harsch is at present East European correspondent for the *Christian Science Monitor*. Born in Toledo, Ohio, in 1905, he has an A.B. degree from Williams College and also honorary degrees from Corpus Christi College of Cambridge University in England. Mr. Harsch has been with the *Christian Science Monitor* since 1929, serving at various times as correspondent from Washington, Rome, and Berlin. He has also been a news commentator for the Columbia Broadcasting System both in this country and in Berlin.

HANS V. KALTENBORN—Dean of radio commentators, H. V. Kaltenborn made his first news broadcast in 1922. Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Kaltenborn was graduated from Harvard in 1909 with an A.B. cum laude. Since then, he has received several honorary degrees. For twenty years, 1910-1930, he was associated with the *Brooklyn Eagle*. In 1930, he left the *Eagle* for WABC, key station for the Columbia network. Since 1940, he has been with the National Broadcasting Company. Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio reporter for many political conventions, national and international congresses, League of Nations sessions, Pan American Peace Conferences, and the like. His honors and citations for meritorious radio reporting are too numerous to mention. He was awarded a gold plaque for the best foreign radio reporting covering the Spanish front in 1936, when he took the microphone on the field and made possible the first radio transmission of artillery and machine-gun fire during actual combat. Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of several books and many magazine articles. Among his books are *We Look at the World*, *Kaltenborn Edits the News*, and *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Mr. Kaltenborn is widely traveled and has a knowledge of several foreign languages including French, German, and Italian.

ain and America are in exactly the same boat insofar as Russia is concerned, and that is not true. (Applause.)

Of course, we have much in common with Britain, but our atti-

tude toward colonial native peoples is much more similar to the doctrine which has been preached by the Russians.

✓ We are not in exactly the same boat with any nation. We want

earnestly to maintain our wartime alliances, but we don't want to be Siamese twins with anybody. (*Applause.*)

Then, I don't like the use of the word "fear." That is a weakening, paralyzing word, which makes constructive, vigorous action impossible. But to answer the question, it is obvious that the United States and to an even greater extent Great Britain have reason to watch Russia with concern. Mr. Kaltenborn has eloquently given some of the reasons.

Equally clearly, Russia is viewing the United States and Great Britain with concern. In fact, the international air is so thick with huge, black, billowing clouds of suspicion that every nation is a prey to the same psychology. In this present vicious circle, something new and fundamental and radical must happen to get international relations off dead center. I will go along with Dr. Davis for a direct contact between the President and Marshal Stalin.

Mr. Harsch also spoke wisely when he said that the first thing is for both Russia and the United States to define the limits of their respective aims. For this reason it is well-nigh appalling to me to think that we appear at the present critical moment in the history of the world to have no frank and personally friendly contact with Russia's policy-makers.

There is one radical and funda-

mental thing which I would like to see happen here in America and which would be a powerful influence for good in the world. That is for us to get back some of our old, evangelistic enthusiasm about our way of doing things here in the United States. (*Applause.*)

The Russians have got lots of enthusiasm about their way of doing things. When you look at the performance of the Red Army, you can see why they are proud of their military deeds. It's also believable that their system has improved their peacetime economic conditions, but what's the matter with our system?

There is still every reason why we Americans should be strongly enthusiastic about it—about its military results in war, its material results in peace, and its safeguarding of those spiritual values which make the dignity of men. (*Applause.*)

The Russians are so enthusiastic that they communicate it contagiously to peoples in other lands. Why can't we? Think how this contagion could affect foreign policy.

The only American foreign policy visible to many foreigners today is the evaporation of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. Can it be that we Americans have grown apathetic and sophisticated and cynical about the precepts which made this country and made it great?

Have we forgotten, for instance, those thunderous words which proclaimed the self-evident truth, and I quote: "That all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights," and that among these are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Have we forgotten, and I quote again, "That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men." That's what Governments are for.

Are there many Americans who don't know that these lines are from the Declaration of Independence? Do we make fun of them and say that they are old-fashioned? Then we no longer understand America—her past performance and her future promise.

In this time of international turmoil, we are uncertain and ignorant of many things. We must think and talk with restraint, distrust propaganda, and suspend judgment.

We must in every possible way strengthen the UNO. But of one thing we can be sure, and that is, that, pending the arrival of world disarmament and world government, a strong America is our best security. No foreign policy can be stronger than the national strength behind it. *(Applause.)*

I disagree with Dr. Davis that American military strength is a threat to Russia. As General Eisenhower said: "Our Armed Forces

have but one purpose—to discourage or to repel aggression." This means Army, Navy, and Air Forces—yes. It means full industrial production on the homefront—yes. Those are two ways for a nation to be strong. But above all, it means enthusiastic faith in our way of living and doing. This faith is our first line of defense and the armature of all the defense lines which follow.

The question is *not* "Have we any reason to fear Russia?" Of course we have reason to view her present actions with concern, but from my point of view, the real question is: "Have we reason to be confident in ourselves?" *(Applause.)*

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Senator Lodge. This doesn't seem to be a simple "yes or no" question after all, now does it? Now gentlemen, let's see what we can do up here around the microphone together a few minutes before we take the questions from this representative Town Hall audience.

Mr. Kaltenborn, you've been quiet for quite some time. I wonder if we could hear from you.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, naturally, I was busy making notes while Mr. Davis was talking. I only wish I had another five minutes to answer some of the points that he made, but if I can have one minute—

Mr. Denny: One minute and a question.

Mr. Kaltenborn: All right. Russia, he says, fought in the cause of freedom. Whose freedom? Russia fought in self-defense! (*Applause.*) And she only fought because the ally, Adolph Hitler, which she picked at the beginning of the war, stabbed her in the back. (*Applause.*) Davis says she wants free access to the Dardanelles. We offered her that. It wasn't enough. She wants to dominate the Dardanelles with her own forts. That's something else.

There's nothing in the Charter to prevent our holding bases. Why, we gave to Russia the finest basis in the Pacific—the Kuril Islands. Why shouldn't we hold the few of those that we conquered. She never conquered the Kurils, and yet we gave them to her. (*Applause.*) Laski is quoted against Churchill. Well, I'd rather quote Churchill against Laski. (*Applause.*)

And since Mr. Davis says the Soviet Union has compromised with us, I wish he'd outline a few of the compromises that she has made.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Davis, the microphone is yours.

Mr. Davis: Russia has compromised with us in putting in rival ministers in various cabinets of Europe. England and the United States do not have opposition men in her cabinets. Russia has agreed to it. Russia has compromised in allowing free elections. (*Shouts.*)

I mean free elections in Finland, Austria, and Hungary. So far as I am aware, Russia has had more free elections in foreign countries than our own Army has held in places where we control. (*Applause.*) Russia also compromised against her best judgment on the admission of Argentina into the UNO. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Lodge, have you got anything to add to that? Or, here, Mr. Kaltenborn has something to say to that.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Just one line. Russia didn't compromise on Argentina. She was defeated, and I am sorry that she was.

Mr. Denny: Now, Mr. Harsch.

Mr. Harsch: Just one point. Russia came into the war in self-defense, but as I recall, we did too. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn, any other points?

Mr. Kaltenborn: We were in the war long before we actually came in in self-defense, because lend-lease, the use of our destroyers, the exchange of destroyers for bases—all those were concrete contributions to the right cause. Russia didn't make any except to the wrong cause. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Davis: Sumner Wells, Under Secretary of State, said that the highest statesmanship of any foreign minister was Litvinoff. He pleaded for years that we stop aggression. He pleaded that we attack Hitler. (*Applause.*) We failed to do it.

Mr. Kaltenborn: And what became of Litvinoff? Just because he represented that international spirit, he was ousted and he's been ousted ever since. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Davis: Mr. Litvinoff was Ambassador to the United States, and I don't call that being exactly ousted, and today he is Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in Moscow. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: All right. Litvinoff was called back when they needed him after Russia was attacked, not before. (*Shouts.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. This seems to be a place to pause briefly for a station identification.

Announcer: You are listening to

America's Town Meeting of the Air from Town Hall in New York City where we are carrying on a discussion of the question, "Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?" We have heard from H. V. Kaltenborn, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Joseph C. Harsch, and Jerome Davis. They are about to take questions from the audience. For a complete copy of this discussion, including the question period to follow immediately, send for the Town Meeting Bulletin. Write to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing. Be sure to include your zone number and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Now, ladies and gentlemen, to promote good questions, Town Hall is offering a \$25 United States Savings Bond for the question that is considered best in the opinion of our committee of judges, for the purpose of bringing out facts and clarifying this discussion, provided these questions are limited to 25 words.

We have selected a number of questions from among several hundred sent in by our radio audience, and we are paying \$5 each for those questions used. Now, please confine yourselves to questions and not speeches. We'll start with the

gentleman in the first row in the balcony.

Man: Mr. Davis, what principles of democracy have you observed in Russia that could serve as mutual ground for lasting friendship between Russia, America and Britain?

Mr. Davis: I think that Russia has made remarkable progress in the quarter of a century since the Czarist tyranny. She has racial democracy which I think is superior to some other countries. In Russia, it's a criminal offense to show any racial prejudice against any other group. (*Applause.*)

Man: Mr. Kaltenborn, in your opinion, is there a relationship between the uprising of the Kurds in Iran and Russia's request for the postponement of the UNO?

Mr. Kaltenborn: The general belief is that there is a relationship. The Kurdish tribesmen in Iran represent a tribe that is also in Iraq and also in Turkey and it has been the practice of Russia in injecting herself into Iran to create a Communist revolution and thereby take over a part of the country. It is the general belief that she is now trying to do the same thing in a part of Iraq and a part of Turkey.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Here's a question for Mr. Jerome Davis along the same lines from Spartanburg, South Carolina. "What does Russia really want in Iran that requires the continued presence of her troops there?"

Mr. Davis: Russia wants the oil in the north because Britain has the oil in the south. There has been, as you know, an autonomous republic in Azerbaijan and it is the life line, the land link, between Europe, Asia, and Africa, and Russia wants to feel secure. I hope she'll withdraw her troops but there is reason why it is difficult to do. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: It is quite true as Mr. Davis says that Russia wants

the oil in northern Iran. Britain has the oil in southern Iran but Britain has no oil in the British Isles whereas Russia has a large part of the world's oil supply within her own frontiers. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. This gentleman here.

Man: Senator Lodge. Senator Lodge has stated something with which I agree heartily. He says that we should spread the contagion of American ideology into Russia. But how do you propose to do it?

Senator Lodge: I think it is a very difficult thing to spread anything into Russia as long as they persist in a policy of censorship. I just hope that that censorship won't last forever and that in the meantime we can spread our ideology, which I think is more thrilling and more compelling than any other ideology in the world, to the countries in other parts of the world and hope it will seep through. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: All right. Senator Lodge, here's a question from Boscowen, New Hampshire. "Why shouldn't Russia dominate the Dardanelles since the Mediterranean Sea is practically a British lake?" (Laughter.)

Senator Lodge: I don't see why anybody wants to dominate anything. I don't think that word dominate is a good word. I have the greatest sympathy with the

desire of Russia to have access to warm-water ports in the Mediterranean and in the Persian Gulf and in the Pacific. But I don't see why she wants to dominate the Dardanelles at all. I don't agree with that. I'd like her to have full use of it.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Davis, you spoke about that in your speech. Do you care to comment on it further? The question was why should Russia seek to dominate the Dardanelles while England has domination over the Mediterranean Sea.

Mr. Davis: The Dardanelles gives Russia free access to the ocean, and the Allies, it is true, have said that they will allow Russia to use the Dardanelles both in peace and war. The difficulty is that if war occurred, Russia fears that immediately that access would be closed. Therefore, she wants one port in order to protect that free access, just the same as Britain has Gibraltar. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Harsch wants to comment on that.

Mr. Harsch: I don't know whether there is anything in this but it is a point I would like to suggest as possible. Russia was a pariah of the nations before the last war. I think one of the things she hoped to get out of the war was a recognition of equality of stature with the outside world. They see us with one of the manifestations of our greatness—ownership in all times of the Panama

Canal and the British ownership of the Suez and I think that they want the Dardanelles partly for prestige—just to be able to say they're as good as the rest of us. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Harsch. Now, the gentleman over here.

Man: This question is for Mr. Harsch. Recognizing that the democratic way of life is freedom for the individual and in Russia they believe that the individual is secondary or subservient to the state, how can we reconcile these differences?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Harsch, in a minute and a half, please. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Harsch: I don't think you can reconcile them. I think that was one of the things I was trying to say before when I said we're different. I think we've got to recognize that we're different and the only hope of being able to live with that difference is derived from the teaching of history. We managed to live with Czarist Russia doing the same thing that Soviet Russia is doing today for a long time. The British fought little peripheral wars with them every once in a while, but they did manage, on big issues, to keep together.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Harsch. The lady with that handsome new hat. (*Laughter.*) It's very becoming. (*Laughter.*)

Lady: Mr. Kaltenborn, you infer that Britain is entitled to the oil and Russia is not because Russia has some. How then is America entitled to the American-Arabian pipe line just constructed? We have oil. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Oh! We've gotten into the oil question now.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, of course, that Ickes oil line that was projected across Saudi Arabia is now a dead duck. As a matter of fact, I should be perfectly willing to see Russia receive from Iran, acting without compulsion and without the presence of troops, the opportunity to develop oil fields in Northern Iran. What I primarily object to is the methods that she is using to secure those fields. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Senator Lodge?

Senator Lodge: I would just like to comment on the question from the lady there. Mr. Ickes, in his capacity of Secretary of the Interior and in charge of our conservation laws, has officially reported that our expenditures of oil in this last war was so great that we have not got enough oil in this country ever to sustain another major war. So it is vitally important for us to acquire oil outside of the United States. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Just a minute. We always encourage people to talk

back. The lady wants to talk back. Come ahead.

Lady: That's all the more reason for not having a war. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: All the more reason for not having a war! Mr. Davis?

Mr. Davis: Russia's oil field was largely damaged and destroyed. She needs this extra oil; she applied to Iran for it before the troops were occupying there and did not get it. Now she wants to get it and I think the whole issue could be settled if it was given to her. (*Applause.*)

Man: My question is: Do you believe Russia would share the secret of the atomic bomb if she possessed it, and can you give instances of her willingness to reciprocate?

Mr. Davis: I don't know whether Russia would share the secret of the atomic bomb—probably she wouldn't, but I'm inclined to think that all nations will get that secret, as our scientists have said. Now, she has cooperated during the war. General Eisenhower said they cooperated fully at every point, gave them everything he asked, and he was completely satisfied. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Man in the second row, balcony.

Man: My question is for Mr. Harsch. Mr. Kaltenborn cited numerous instances of Russian aggression. You implied similar American aggression. Will you cite comparable examples of pres-

ent-day, 1946, American aggression?

Mr. Harsch: I regret the use of the word "aggression." I shouldn't use "aggression" with regard to anyone. There are expansionist tendencies on all sides. When you think of it in terms of expansion, I don't believe that there is any nation in the world which has expanded its prewar sphere of influence as far as we have out of this war. We began this war an American hemisphere power; we are today in physical factual control, not only of the American continents—North and South—but of the Atlantic and Pacific Ocean bases and a very large part of Asia. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Question, second row balcony.

Man: Senator Lodge. How can we of the United States conduct ourselves, or act, so that Russia will respect us?

Senator Lodge: Well, speaking very generally—it's a very general question—it means not talking too much, and being firm, and meaning what you say. It means keeping your word whenever you give it and not necessarily giving it very often. (*Laughter.*) It means realizing that the Russians are a practical people who have come along in a hard school of international relations and who realize that force, after all, is the thermal unit of international politics.

That's the general attitude I have in mind. (*Applause.*)

Man: Question to Mr. Davis. If Russia permits individual freedom, why are the greatest democrats of Bulgaria and Rumania—Ghitcheff Mouchanoff, and Dr. Juliu Maniu—in jail?

Mr. Denny: We didn't get that question. If Russia believes in individual freedom, why are certain leaders in what countries in jail?

Man: In Rumania and Bulgaria.

Mr. Davis: I do not know about the gentlemen that he cited, but in any postwar period you have conflicts, especially when you are trying to divide up the big landed estates and nationalize the factories. I think we'd have them here if we tried the same thing. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Lady on the front row, balcony.

Lady: Question to Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Denny: Just a minute. The gentleman wants to talk back.

Man: I should like to say that anyone who wants to get up on the platform of the Town Hall of the Air ought to know the greatest peasant leader of Rumania between World War I and World War II, Dr. Juliu Maniu. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Dr. Juliu Maniu is the man's name—that's the gentleman referred to.

Lady: My question is for Mr. Kaltenborn. You advocate military

preparedness. Preceding World War I the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance were armed to the teeth. How would you prevent World War III, if we had such a high state of military preparedness? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Just a word in defense of Dr. Davis. He knows Dr. Juliu Maniu of Rumania extremely well. It's simply that he didn't understand the pronunciation as it was given by the gentleman, who will admit that he has a slight foreign accent. (*Applause.*)

Now coming to that question—obviously we don't want another race in armaments and obviously the United States was in a fair way to lead a race, not in armaments, but in disarmament. Every one of our military leaders has told us about the disorganization of our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, that has followed the almost panicky demobilization which we have carried on. We cannot permit that to continue. We must get back some of the strength that we had during the war. We have lost it and in the face of the present situation of the world—in the face of the danger of aggression by Russia—we must, at least, have the strength to answer by showing that we are not weak—that we can back up what we say. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Senator Lodge has something to say.

Senator Lodge: I just would like

to say this in furtherance of what Mr. Kaltenborn said: The United States has never been involved in war because we were too well prepared—we've always gotten in with a very small degree of preparedness.

Mr. Denny: Mr. Lodge, here's a question from Roanoke, Virginia. "Since the United States seeks to control the secret of the atom bomb, does Russia need to fear us?"

Senator Lodge: There are two things that can be said to that question. We don't seek to keep Russia from having the atomic bomb throughout all eternity. I think we are seeking to use our knowledge of the atomic bomb to develop proper international control of that weapon and proper international inspection of bomb production facilities. I do think that it is natural for the Russians to react rather queerly, shall we say, to the fact that we used the atomic bomb and that they don't know anything about it. We can put ourselves in their place and I think we would have reacted a little queerly, too. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Here's a question for Mr. Kaltenborn from Detroit, Michigan. "We have our Monroe Doctrine, Britain has her Empire. Why shouldn't Russia have her sphere of influence? (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn: No one in his senses would oppose giving Russia

a sphere of influence. She dominates one-sixth of the land surface of the world without the territories that she has acquired as a result of the war. It seems to me that her sphere of influence is pretty large. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The soldier here.

Soldier: Question for Mr. Davis. Does Mr. Davis know that Finland is unable to pay the reparations imposed by Russia, and does he call that fair?

Mr. Davis: All I can say is that at the time I was in Russia, and I've been in Finland since, I heard no responsible ambassador of the allied powers but who expressed surprise and delight that the reparations demanded were so small and, if I'm not mistaken, Russia has decreased the reparations demand since the peace was made. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Davis, here's a question from Chicago, Illinois. "Why should we allow communism over here full swing when Russia will not grant democracy the same privilege over there? (Applause.)

Mr. Davis: I suppose because we believe in democracy. We believe that we can meet the challenge of democracy. When I was in New Haven, a wealthy woman called me up and said, "How can we stop the Communists parading?" I said, "What do they parade about?" She said, "They want free lunches

for the starving children in the schools." I said, "Why not give them to the children?" So the children got free lunches. Now we believe in meeting the communist challenge by free democracy. Russia doesn't. (Applause.)

Mr. Denny: Here's a question for Joseph C. Harsch from Cincinnati, Ohio. "Since one of the fundamental aims of Communist Russia is the overthrow of capitalism, what are the chances for world peace under such circumstances?

Mr. Harsch: If overthrow of capitalism remains, for all time, a first fundamental purpose of Communist Russia, I think that's just another reason why we're going to go on having to try to live with people that are strangers to us in all ways. I'm not sure that it is a great deal more now than a slogan. It's used for internal consumption and discipline.

Mr. Denny: Used for internal consumption and discipline, he said. Mr. Davis.

Mr. Davis: I'd just like to say that we seemed to get along with the Czarist tyranny which I think was infinitely worse than the progress the Bolsheviks have been making under Russia. (Applause.)

Man: Mr. Lodge. I believe you said, or at least suggested, that we should have a meeting of Stalin and Mr. Attlee and Mr. Truman. Now, do you believe that—

Mr. Denny: What's the question,

please. Question. What's the question?

Man: Do you believe that we can solve any problems in conferences between those three people when two of those do not have the power to make commitments?

Senator Lodge: I suggested a direct contact between the President and Marshal Stalin. I did so not on the basis of making commitments. I did so in the hope that there would be a chance for us to find out just what the limits are on the aims of the Russians, and for them to find out what our aims are. What are the things that we really care a lot about and what are the things that we just care about a little bit and get some notion of where we stand.

I wasn't suggesting it with the idea of getting commitments. I was suggesting it with the idea of developing a frank, friendly personal relationship which can mean such a great deal in international affairs and which we lack so much at the present time.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Senator Lodge. Now you're going to hear a little more on this subject in the way of summaries from Mr. Jerome Davis and Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn in just a moment. But in the meantime, here's Fred V. Cole to tell you about our programs for the next two weeks.

Mr. Cole: Second only to the discussion we discussed this evening is your continued interest in

atomic energy. As you regular Town Meeting listeners well know, we've had several lively discussions on this question. But just now, greatest interest centers on the question, "Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?" Should it be controlled by the military or by civilians?

Next week this important question will be discussed by Senator Brien McMahon, Democrat of Connecticut, chairman of the Senate Committee on Atomic Energy; Senator Edwin Johnson, Democrat of Colorado, and member of the Senate Atomic Energy Committee; Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas, Democrat of California, and member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee; and Major General Thomas F. Farrell, chief engineer of the State of New York, Department of Public Works.

The following week, April 4, our topic will be, "Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15." Two distinguished veterans, both well known to Town Hall audiences, ex-Colonel Tex McCrary and ex-Sergeant Millard Lampell, will be joined by two other well-known speakers. Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Denny.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Now the negative of this question, "Have Britain and America Any Reason to Fear Russia?" let's hear first from Dr. Jerome Davis.

Dr. Davis: Mr. Kaltenborn's

thesis is to stop Russia at all costs. My father was a colonel in the Civil War. He tells of a Negro, paralyzed with fear, running for dear life down a sloping road, as a spent cannon-ball rolled after him. Someone yelled, "Get up on the bank." In reply, the Negro said, "I can't beat it running down, how am I going to beat it up the hill?"

Kaltenborn fears Russia. His chief solution is armaments and be tough with Russia—harsh.

Senator Lodge and myself believe that there is another way. It may be uphill work, but it is standing for justice within a framework of friendship, counderstanding with Russia.

Accept Russian aid in curing western imperialism.

Stand firm for the UNO but apply its principles to all countries and all nations. Don't make Russia the only culprit.

Stand for justice for all humanity. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Davis. Now a final word from Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn on the affirmative. Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I think Mr. Davis has come closer to my point of view in that final statement than he has throughout the evening. Certainly we want to stand for justice and fair dealing through the United Nations. That's what we'll begin to do on Monday when

we consider Russia's aggression against Iran. *(Applause.)* The United Nations have been fair. They considered what was said to be Britain's aggression against the Indonesians. Russia is not the only power that was brought before the United Nations, but Britain was able to present her case, and it was accepted by public opinion of the world as a good case.

All that Russia needs to do is to go before the United Nations on Monday. Will she? No. She's trying to postpone until she can bring her pressure on Iran and get what she wants. *(Applause.)*

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn, Senator Lodge, Mr. Harsch, and Mr. Davis for your frank and constructive discussion of tonight's question. And I want to congratulate all of you—radio and visible audience, as well—for the quality of your questions tonight. Now here is the vote of our committee of judges who award the \$25 United States Savings Bond for tonight's best question, which they say is, "How can we of the United States conduct ourselves or act so that Russia will respect us?" The gentleman from Mineola — we don't have your name*—please come up afterwards and get your bond. Now we invite you all to join us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's Bell. *(Applause.)*

*Dominic F. Serra.